## Exhibit C

```
Page 1
 1
                  IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2.
              FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
 3
                            SOUTHERN DIVISION
                           No. 7:23-CV-897
 4
 5
     IN RE:
                                     )
     CAMP LEJEUNE WATER LITIGATION)
 6
     This document relates to
 7
                                     )
 8
     ALL CASES
 9
10
11
12
13
14
                   The remote video deposition of
15
                   MORRIS MASLIA, taken via
16
                   Zoom videoconference on the 29th day
17
                   of May, 2025, commencing at
                   approximately 11:58 p.m. EST.
18
19
2.0
21
2.2
23
24
25
```

	Page 2
1	APPEARANCES
2	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
3	WEITZ & LUXENBERG
	700 Broadway, 2nd Floor
4	New York, New York 10003
	BY: Laura J. Baughman, Esq.
5	Lbaughman@weitzlux.com
	Devin Bolton, Esq.
6	Dbolton@weitzlux.com
7	
•	FOR THE DEFENDANT:
8	
0	U. S. Department of Justice
9	P.O. Box 340, Ben Franklin Station
10	Washington, D.C. 20044 BY: Haroon Anwar, Esquire
10	Haroon.anwar@usdoj.gov
11	Giovanni Antonucci, Esquire
	Giovanni.antonucci@usdoj.gov
12	
13	ALSO PRESENT:
14	Alex Spiliotopoulos
	Deanna Havai
15	
16	
17	VIDEOGRAPHER:
18	James Vonweigen
19	
20	
	Lois Anne Robinson, RPR, RDR, CRR
21	Court Reporter
22	
23	
24	
25	

		Page 3
1	INDEX	
2	EXAMINATION	PAGE
3	By Mr. Anwar	5
4	By Ms. Baughman	5 6
5	* * * *	
6	EXHIBITS	
7	Exhibit Number 1	8
8	Supplemental report	
9	Exhibit Number 2	4 4
10	TT Supply Wells - Table A9	
11	Exhibit Number 3	5 3
12	CLJA_WATERMODELING_01-0000093047 -	- 114
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
2 4		
25		

	Page 4
1	VIDEOGRAPHER:
2	We're now on the record.
3	My name is James Vonwiegen. I'm a
4	videographer for Golkow.
5	Today's date is Thursday, May 29th,
6	2025, and the time is 11:58 a.m.
7	This remote video deposition is being
8	held in the matter of Camp Lejeune Water
9	Litigation, No. 7:23-CV-897, versus the United
L 0	States of America, for the United States District
L1	Court for the Eastern Eastern District of
L 2	North Carolina.
L 3	The deponent is Morris Maslia.
L 4	All parties to the deposition are
L 5	appearing remotely and have agreed to the witness
L 6	being sworn in remotely. Due to the nature of
L 7	remote reporting, please pause briefly before
L 8	speaking to ensure all parties are heard
L 9	completely.
20	Counsel will be noted on the
21	stenographic record.
22	The court reporter is Lois Robinson and
23	will now swear in the witness.
24	MORRIS MASLIA,
25	the witness, after having first been

Page 5 1 duly sworn to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, was examined and 2 testified as follows: 3 4 EXAMINATION BY MR. ANWAR: 5 Good afternoon, Mr. Maslia. 6 Q Good afternoon. Α 8 Nice to see you again. 9 My name is Haroon Anwar. We've met 10 before, in your prior two depositions in this 11 case; correct? That is correct, sir. 12 13 All right. My time is somewhat limited 14 with you today, so I'm sort of not gonna go 15 through all of the deposition rules again other 16 than to say the same rules apply as before and as 17 in your prior depositions in March of 2025 and September of 2024. Do you understand that? 18 19 Yes, I do. Δ 2.0 And the most important rule is Okay. 21 to testify truthfully, because you are under oath 22 as if you were in an actual court of law. understand that? 23 24 Yes, I do. 25 Q Is there anything that would prevent

Page 6 1 you from testifying truthfully here today? No, there's not. 2 3 I see that you're in a room there. Ιs there anyone in that room with you currently? 4 There is no one else in this room. 5 Α No. And do you have any materials or 6 Okay. notes there with you in that room? I have the documents that the 8 9 plaintiffs' legal group submitted to DOJ pertinent to Tarawa Terrace, model bias, and 10 11 geometric mean analysis. Understood. 12 0 13 Are you referring to the -- the 14 supplemental report that you submitted in this 15 case? 16 Yes, I am. 17 And do you have with you the -- the 18 spreadsheets that accompanied that report as well? 19 2.0 Α Yes, I do. I printed everything out. 21 Okay. And aside from the supplemental 22 report and those two spreadsheets, do you have 23 anything else in the room there with you? 24 I've got the published ATSDR Tarawa 25 Terrace Chapter A report.

Page 7 of 76

Page 7 1 Okay. Q Okay. And a journal article. 2 Α What -- what journal article do you 3 have there with you? 4 I've got the journal article by J. 5 Felix Rogers, published in 1999. It also uses 6 and discusses the use of model and geometric bias, or epidemiological case-control studies. 8 9 Did you cite that publication in your 10 supplemental report? 11 I don't know if I cited it in my --Α 12 I don't believe I cited it in my 13 supplemental, but I believe I cited it in the 14 original ATSDR report under the reference 15 section. 16 Okav. Understood. 17 And why do you -- why do you have that 18 publication with you today? 19 It's a, in my opinion, it's a great Δ 2.0 example with a different kind of model. They 21 used an air dispersion model rather than a 22 contaminant fate and transport model but used the 23 same technique that we did to assess the model fit, because they went on, after using the model 24 25 result, to compute individual exposures for a

```
Page 8
1
     case-control epidemiological study.
               And you said that was for a
2
     case-control epi study; correct?
3
               Yes. Yes.
4
     Α
5
               Okay.
               And it's from a published,
6
    peer-reviewed published journal.
8
               Understood.
9
               Let's go ahead and mark as Exhibit 1
10
     your supplemental report in this case.
11
              (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NUMBER 1
               WAS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.)
12
13
     MR. ANWAR:
14
               Gio, could you screen share and maybe
15
     drop that into the chat?
16
     MR. ANTONUCCI:
17
               Hey, folks, screen share is not
18
     currently turned on.
19
     MR. ANWAR:
2.0
               Well, can -- would you mind --
21
               Oh, there it is. Great.
22
               Okay. Mr. Maslia, this is a copy of --
     0
23
               And, you know, we can scroll through
     all three pages of your report there for you.
24
25
               But is this a true and accurate copy of
```

Page 9 1 the supplemental report you submitted in this 2 case? Yes, it is. 3 Α Okay. And that's -- that's -- you have 4 5 a paper copy there with you in the room; correct? Yes -- yes -- yes, I do, right here. 6 Α All right. Feel free to refer to your Q 8 paper copy. 9 Α Okay. 10 Does your paper copy have any 11 handwritten notes on it or anything like that? 12 А No handwritten notes. Got the same 13 lettering or identification numbers as you're 14 showing me on the screen at the bottom. 15 Understood. 16 And your supplemental report, your 17 Exhibit 1, it's entitled "Assessing Model Fit With Sampling Data at Tarawa Terrace Water Supply 18 Wells and the Water Treatment Plant." Correct? 19 2.0 Α That is correct. 21 It's dated April 24, 2025; right? 22 That is correct. Α 23 And the first page says "by Morris L. 24 That's you; right? Maslia." 25 Α That is correct. That is me. I'm the

Page 10 1 author. And you anticipated my next question. 2 Did you draft this report? 3 Yes, I did. 4 Α 5 Did anyone assist you in drafting the 6 report? Not in drafting the report. Α 8 Did you -- did anyone assist you in 9 developing the contents within the report, for the opinions within the report? 10 11 No, they did not. Α 12 Did you speak with Dr. Konikow about 13 your opinions in this report? 14 I asked him to review my write-up, yes. Α 15 Did he provide you with any feedback? 16 Yes, he did. 17 What -- what feedback did he provide 0 18 you? 19 I believe he provided some verbiage, Δ 2.0 some more refined verbiage. 21 Do you recall in which -- which portion 22 of the report? 23 I -- I think one example where we're 24 talking about the model bias halfway on the first 25 page, where it says "C simulated divided by C

observed." Where that equals 1, I think I had said that showed, additionally, a perfect model fit, and he correctly pointed out that's -- there are other statistics you need to look at besides saying that. But it does show about -- a value of 1 shows that the model is unbiased. So I edited the text for that.

O Got it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Did Dr. Konikow provide you any other feedback besides that?

A Only about we used the detection limits and things like that towards the end. I think it's on page --

It may be -- yeah, under the discussion section, perhaps. Yes.

Looking at the detection limit, whatever value it is, versus half the detection limit, we're looking -- you know, using it as sort of a sensitivity of -- of the model to varying values assigned to nondetect values.

O Understood.

Besides your attorney -- the attorneys for the plaintiffs in this case and besides

Dr. Konikow, did anyone else review your report prior to submitting it in the litigation?

Page 12 of 76

1 A Yes. Dr. Norm Jones and Mr. Jeff Davis

- 2 reviewed the Excel files for accuracy and
- 3 correctness.
- 4 | Q And did you receive any feedback from
- 5 Dr. Jones or Mr. Davis?
- 6 A Yes, I did.
- 7 Q What do you recall that that feedback
- 8 was?
- 9 A It was basically I had hard-coded,
- 10 which refers to hard-coding some of the formulas,
- 11 and he suggested using the actual dynamic
- 12 formulas so if things get changed, the formulas
- 13 | are still valid.
- 14 Q Understood.
- 15 Any other feedback that Dr. Jones or
- 16 Mr. Davis provided?
- 17 | A No.
- 18 Q Aside from the plaintiffs' lawyers,
- 19 Dr. Konikow, Dr. Jones, and Mr. Davis, did anyone
- 20 else review your report before you submitted it?
- 21 A No.
- 22 | Q Now, you provided two spreadsheets with
- 23 | your -- your supplemental report; correct?
- 24 A That is correct.
- 25 | Q And these spreadsheets reflect the

Page 13 of 76

1 updated calculations you performed with respect

- to geometric bias for ATSDR's Tarawa Terrace 2
- water model; right? 3
- 4 That is correct.
- Now, one of the spreadsheets reflects 5
- the updated geometric bias calculations for the 6
- Tarawa Terrace supply wells; correct?
- That is correct. 8
- 9 And the other spreadsheet reflects
- updated geometric bias calculations for the 10
- 11 Tarawa Terrace water treatment plant. Correct?
- That is correct. 12 Α
- 13 During your deposition back in March of
- 14 2025, earlier this year, you testified that you
- 15 had notes reflecting these calculations. Do you
- 16 recall that?
- 17 Α Yes.
- 18 Do you still have those notes?
- 19 I do not believe. Once I put it into a
- 2.0 more formal document, then I threw away the
- 21 actual handwritten notes. I felt they were, for
- someone else, difficult to follow; whereas, the 22
- 23 Excel sheets and the written discussion would be
- straightforward and easier to -- to follow. 24
- Understood. 25 Q

1 We had, in your prior deposition, requested a copy of those handwritten notes, but 2 it sounds like it's your testimony here today 3

- that you threw those notes away and you no longer 4 have them. 5
- That is correct. 6
- Is there -- was there anything in those notes that's not reflected in your supplemental
- 9 report?

8

- The report reflect the notes, my 10 No.
- 11 hand -- hand notes, in a more legible format and
- 12 understandable format.
- 13 I want to talk to you a little
- 14 bit about geometric bias generally. My
- 15 understanding is geometric bias is a statistic or
- a calculation that allows one to test the 16
- 17 accuracy of a model. Is that right?
- I would say it -- it allows one to test 18 А
- 19 the goodness of fit -- okay? -- of the model to
- 2.0 the field matter -- to the field matter that you
- 21 have.
- 22 Understood.
- 23 And because we are -- we're talking --
- the focus of the litigation and the depositions 24
- 25 is on the water models related to Camp Lejeune

Page 15 of 76

1 | performed by your team at ATSDR, I'm going --

- 2 | when I say "model," I'm going to be referring
- 3 generally to groundwater models. Is that okay
- 4 | with you?
- 5 A That is okay. But for today we're
- 6 referring strictly to Tarawa Terrace; correct?
- 7 Q Correct. Unless I -- unless I ask you
- 8 a question otherwise, it's safe to assume we're
- 9 | talking about Tarawa Terrace.
- 10 | A Okay.
- 11 | Q So, now, geometric bias is expressed in
- 12 terms of a simulated to observed or measured
- 13 ratio; right?
- 14 A No. That -- that is the model bias.
- 15 That is two terms. The model bias is for each
- 16 | individual sampling point and the equivalent
- 17 | simulated value. Okay?
- And, then, when you have a series of
- 19 those -- in our case, I think we had 36 for the
- 20 | supply wells and 25 for the water treatment
- 21 plant, and when you take all of those together,
- 22 | then you -- then you come up with a geometric
- 23 bias.
- 24 Q Understood. Thank you for -- for that
- 25 clarification.

Page 16 of 76

1 So for the Tarawa Terrace model, the geometric bias was calculated to assess the 2 goodness of fit or the calibration of the fate 3 and transport model for PCE? Is that right? 4 The model results, yes. The simulated 5 or reconstructed concentrations at the water 6 supply wells and, separately, at the water 8 treatment plant. 9 Okay. Now, a geometric bias number below 1 indicates that the groundwater model is 10 11 underpredicting; correct? That's correct. 12 Α 13 In other words, for -- for -- I quess, 14 generally speaking, when we say "underpredicting," we mean that the model 15 16 simulated results are lower than the actual 17 real-world concentration or sampling data. 18 Correct? 19 It would be lower than -- in the 20 overall sense, than the measured sampled data, 21 yes. 22 And a geometric bias equalling 1 23 indicates exact agreement between the -- the

groundwater model or the model simulated results

24

25

Page 17 of 76

and actual real-world sampling data.

```
1
               Again, that's where I think the
    document that I provide where we used unbiased is
2
3
    probably a more appropriate term. To get an
     exact match, you would have to do some other
4
     statistics.
5
               Understood. I -- and I will represent
6
     to you the -- the exact -- I guess exact
     agreement language came directly from ATSDR's
8
9
    report in chapter --
               Well, it sounds like you don't
10
11
    necessarily disagree with --
12
               We're -- we're basically saying the
13
     same thing. Is that fair?
14
               That is -- that is fair. Yes, sir.
    Α
15
               And, then, a geometric bias greater
     than 1 indicates that the model or the
16
17
    groundwater model is overpredicting; right?
18
    Α
               That is correct.
19
               And, so, in other words, the -- the
2.0
    model simulated results are estimated -- PC
21
    concentrations, for instance, in the Tarawa
    Terrace water model are coming out higher than
22
23
    the actual available sampling data. Is that
```

Α

right?

24

25

Page 18 of 76

That is correct.

1 Q Is geometric bias the only way to

2 assess that accuracy for goodness of fit of a

- 3 | model?
- 4 A No, it's not. There are other -- other
- 5 methods.
- 6 O What -- what are some of those other
- 7 methods?
- 8 MS. BAUGHMAN:
- 9 I'm gonna object to that. This
- 10 deposition is limited strictly to this document,
- 11 | not other ways he could have done it. It's about
- 12 what he did here. And we've limited the scope
- 13 just to what work was done, not what he could
- 14 | have alternatively done.
- So I'm gonna object and instruct
- 16 Mr. Maslia not to answer that question.
- 17 MR. ANWAR:
- So, I guess two things. One, I would
- 19 ask you to sort of limit your -- your objections
- 20 to scope.
- I think we disagree. I think this is
- 22 directly relevant to the topic. And I would note
- 23 on the record that we will reserve our right to
- 24 | go to Judge Owens and seek more time if you
- 25 | continue instructing Mr. Maslia not to answer

Page 19 of 76

Page 19 1 questions that are directly relevant to his opinions in the supplemental report. 2 3 So, Mr. Maslia, I'm gonna ask you again, is geometric -- geometric bias the only 4 way to assess goodness of fit for a model? 5 MS. BAUGHMAN: 6 7 You can answer that just "yes" or "no." 8 THE WITNESS: 9 Okay. 10 Could you repeat the question one more 11 time? MR. ANWAR: 12 13 Yeah. Is geometric bias the only way 14 to assess goodness of fit for a groundwater 15 model? 16 MS. BAUGHMAN: 17 That's a "yes" or "no." 18 Α No. 19 MR. ANWAR: 2.0 You'd agree it's important to 0 21 qualitatively evaluate the results of a 22 groundmodel water -- groundwater model; right? 23 Α Yes. And it's important to compare the 24 25 simulated results from a groundwater model with

Page 20 of 76

Page 20 1 the actual sampling data; right? 2 Α Yes. And in order to --3 0 Well, strike that. 4 Generally speaking, when -- when 5 evaluating the goodness of fit for a groundwater 6 model, and let's say, in this instance, 8 particularly the Tarawa Terrace model, don't you 9 need enough data to determine a trend in observations to evaluate the goodness of fit? 10 11 MS. BAUGHMAN: 12 Object. Objection. Outside the scope. 13 I'm instructing you not to answer. MR. ANWAR: 14 15 I'm gonna note that we disagree 16 and we reserve our right to keep this deposition 17 open. MS. BAUGHMAN: 18 19 Just for the record, this deposition 2.0 was voluntarily allowed by us -- it's not per 21 court order, because he provided -- Mr. Maslia 22 provided this 4-page document at the request of 23 the DOJ, who asked for this, and the spreadsheet.

court order, questions for one hour regarding the

So we are allowing, by agreement, not

24

25

Page 21 of 76

1 | four pages and his spreadsheets.

The fact that a geometric bias had been done was known to you at the two prior depositions that you had of Mr. Maslia, and you could have asked any questions about alternative methods at that time.

## MR. ANWAR:

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Again, I'm gonna ask you to limit your speaking objections. And if we -- you know, if this continues to be an issue, we will -- this will serve as another basis to keep this deposition open.

What we requested in our prior deposition were his handwritten notes and not a supplemental report. But you-all sup- -- you-all provided this untimely supplemental report, and we -- we agreed to take the additional deposition time.

If we -- if we need more time, we'll go and get a court order, which, based on the representations you've made in court, I'm sure won't be a problem.

Q So, Mr. Maslia, let me ask you this.

Your -- your supplemental report only addresses
geometric bias as it relates to the Tarawa

Page 22 of 76

- 1 Terrace model; correct?
- Model and geometric bias for Tarawa 2
- 3 Terrace.
- Understood. 4 0
- You're not offering any opinions in 5
- your supplemental report about geometric bias 6
- related to the Hadnot Point Holcombe Boulevard
- model; right? 8
- No, I'm not. 9 Α
- And my understanding is the geometric 10
- 11 bias wasn't calculated for the Hadnot Point
- 12 Holcombe Boulevard model; correct?
- 13 MS. BAUGHMAN:
- 14 Objection. That's outside the scope,
- 15 although there is a number provided in a previous
- 16 report. It's just not in this report.
- MR. ANWAR: 17
- 18 Again, I'm gonna ask you to limit your
- 19 speaking objections.
- 2.0 Mr. Maslia, geometric bias wasn't
- 21 calculated for the Hadnot Point Holcombe
- Boulevard model; right? 22
- 23 It is --
- 24 MS. BAUGHMAN:
- 25 Objection. You can answer as -- as it

Page 23 of 76

- 1 pertains to the supplemental report.
- All right. The supplemental report 2
- 3 pertains strictly to Tarawa Terrace. It did not
- consider -- take anything with respect to Hadnot 4
- Point or Holcombe Boulevard into account. 5
- Okay. And if you state this in your 6 Q
- report for the Tarawa Terrace model, the
- geometric bias for the Tarawa Terrace water 8
- 9 supply wells was calculated to be 5.8; correct?
- That is correct. 10
- 11 And the geometric bias for the Tarawa
- Terrace water supply wells, it's -- omitting 12
- 13 TT -- well TT23, was calculated to be 3.9;
- 14 correct?
- 15 That is correct.
- 16 And the geometric bias for the Tarawa
- 17 Terrace water treatment plant was calculated to
- be 1.5; correct? 18
- 19 That is correct.
- 2.0 And I think you say this in your
- 21 report, that these values indicate there was an
- 22 overprediction in the model. Right?
- 23 That is correct.
- In Chapter F of the Tarawa Terrace 24
- 25 report -- or the Chapter F report for the Tarawa

Page 24 of 76

Page 24 1 Terrace model states that the geometric bias values indicate that -- quote, indicate that 2 simulated PCE concentrations moderately to 3 substantially overpredicted observed 4 concentrations at water supply wells. 5 Do you recall that statement? 6 7 I -- I don't specifically. I don't Α have the report in front of me right -- right --8 9 right at this moment. 10 Okay. 11 If it's -- if it's a published ATSDR Α 12 report, then it's written there. 13 Do you agree that, based on those 14 values, the simulated PCE concentrations 15 moderate -- based --16 Let me ask that again. 17 Do you agree that, based on the geometric bias values we just discussed, that the 18 19 simulated PCE concentrations moderately to 2.0 substantially overpredicted observed 21 concentrations at water supply wells? MS. BAUGHMAN: 22 23 Object to form. 24 I'm sorry. I didn't hear that, the last comment. 25

Page 25 of 76

Page 25 1 MS. BAUGHMAN: 2 I -- I objected to the form. 3 THE WITNESS: 4 Okay. MS. BAUGHMAN: 5 6 You can answer. 7 THE WITNESS: 8 Okay. 9 I would say that if we're talking about the TT water supply wells, there is an 10 11 overprediction, and, you know, some are close to 12 Some are great -- greater than 1. Okay? 13 MR. ANWAR: 14 Well, you -- do you -- you don't 15 disagree with what is stated in ATSDR's report, 16 do you? 17 I don't disagree --MS. BAUGHMAN: 18 Object to form. Object to foundation. 19 2.0 Α I don't disagree with what is published 21 in the ATSDR. 22 MR. ANWAR: 23 Q Understood. 24 Now, you can feel free to refer to 25 Exhibit 1 as we continue to talk through these

Page 26 of 76

- 1 issues.
- 2 A Okay.
- 3 | Q So based on your supplemental report,
- 4 | my understanding is -- and the model itself -- is
- 5 | that for the Tarawa Terrace model, the geometric
- 6 | bias was calculated using what you describe as,
- 7 | quote, duplicate samples. Correct?
- 8 A That is correct.
- 9 Q And when you say "duplicate samples,"
- 10 | you don't literally mean identical samples;
- 11 | correct?
- 12 A No. Samples that were either --
- I explained this in the report.
- 14 -- that were either collected on the
- 15 same day or within the same month. We were not
- 16 provided any QA/QC sheets as far as the handling
- 17 of individual samples. Only the results.
- 18 | Q In -- in your supplemental report, you
- 19 recalculated the geometric bias using the average
- 20 of multiple samples taken within the same month.
- 21 | Correct?
- 22 A That is correct.
- 23 Q And this correction was done at the
- 24 | suggestion of Dr. Konikow?
- 25 A He initially did not suggest that I do

Page 27 of 76

 $1\mid$  that with respect to the model of geometric bias.

- 2 He was pointing out -- I believe it's in his
- 3 | expert -- his review, the DOJ expert reports --
- 4 | that there were duplicate samples and that
- 5 perhaps a mean value or one value for the month,
- 6 because we simulated monthly time steps to be
- 7 used.
- 8 0 Understood.
- 9 And for the Tarawa Terrace model, the
- 10 geometric bias was also calculated by excluding
- 11 | nondetect samples; correct?
- 12 A Initially, yes.
- 13 | 0 Initial --
- 14 What do you mean by "initially"?
- 15 A The first spreadsheet for both the key
- 16 | water supply wells, which is a duplicate of table
- 17 9, I believe, in the published Chapter A report
- 18 and the water -- water treatment plant, which is
- 19 a duplicate of the table A10, those were computed
- 20 by not considering or removing not -- a sample
- 21 below detection limit.
- 22 Q And those values and that geometric
- 23 bias calculated by excluding nondetect samples,
- 24 | that's directly reflected in the current
- 25 | published reports for the Tarawa Terrace model;

Page 28 of 76

- 1 right?
- 2 A Yes. Yes. Tables A9 and A10.
- 3 Q And those nondetect values were
- 4 excluded because the formula to calculate
- 5 | geometric bias doesn't allow for zero or
- 6 undefined values? Is that right?
- 7 A Not necessarily. They were initially
- 8 | not included because there could be a variety of
- 9 ways of assigning a value to a nondetect,
- 10 anywhere from zero, which would preclude using a
- 11 geometric bias formula, to 50 percent of the
- 12 detection limit to, you know, the detection
- 13 limit.
- 14 | Q So why was -- why were the -- the
- 15 | nondetect sampling data or sampling -- samples
- 16 excluded from the calculation of geometric bias
- 17 originally?
- 18 A We wanted to try to include as many of
- 19 | the actual samples that were above detection
- 20 | limit as possible. So that's why we -- we did
- 21 that in the original reports.
- 22 | Q Did you consider assigning a value to
- 23 | nondetects in using the assigned value in your
- 24 | calculation of geometric bias when the -- the
- 25 | Tarawa Terrace model was being developed?

1 A We had some internal discussions, and I

- 2 believe we came to a conclusion that it would be
- 3 best at the time just to list the nondetects,
- 4 | which we did in tables A9 and A10, but, in
- 5 | computing the model of geometric bias to assess
- 6 | if it's a fit, not to include them.
- 7 Q Why did you want to include as many
- 8 samples above the detection limit in calculating
- 9 the geometric bias originally?
- 10 A Because if the sample comes in at below
- 11 detection limit, as I've stated before, you don't
- 12 know what value it is. Okay? So now you're
- 13 | introducing even more uncertainty into your
- 14 | analysis by arbitrarily assigning a -- a -- a
- 15 | value just to include that sample.
- 16 | O In --
- So, now, in your supplemental report,
- 18 | you've recalculated the geometric bias using
- 19 assigned values for nondetect samples; correct?
- 20 A That is correct.
- 21 Q And in one scenario, you assigned a
- 22 | value, the detection limit; correct?
- 23 A That is correct, sir.
- 24 Q In the other scenario, you assigned a
- 25 | value of half the detection limit; correct?

- 1 A That is -- that is correct.
- 2 Q And this correction was also suggested
- 3 by Dr. Konikow; right?
- 4 A Yes. He suggested, I believe, if -- if
- 5 | I recall our conversation, 50 percent, and then
- 6 | said, well, we can go ahead and do the detection
- 7 | limit value 1.0 times detection limit, and it
- 8 | would be sort of like a small sensitivity
- 9 analysis to see how sensitive the geometric bias
- 10 and the model bias is to different values
- 11 assigned to nondetects.
- 12 | Q Did Dr. Konikow tell you why he -- he
- 13 | suggested assigning a value to the nondetect
- 14 | samples?
- 15 | A I -- I think it was just a -- you know,
- 16 to --
- I think at the point where we started
- 18 | thinking about what impact or effect of
- 19 reanalyzing the geometric bias, it would be a
- 20 good way to test out to a sensitivity analysis.
- 21 In other words, using the published results,
- 22 unaltered in any way, then using -- taking the
- 23 mean values, the duplicates, and then also
- 24 assigning different values to the nondetects.
- 25 Q Understood.

Page 31 1 Now, the two corrections taken together, the averaging of this -- this same --2 3 the samples within the same month and the assignment of a value to nondetect samples, those 4 resulted, when you recalculated the geometric 5 bias, in a geometric bias closer -- lower than 6 the original calculated geometric biases; 8 correct? 9 Are you referring to the water supply wells or the water treatment plant or both, or 10 11 what are we referring to? 12 Referring to both right now. But --13 Α Okay. Let me just peek here. Yes, 14 yes, yes. Okay. That's -- I'll agree -- agree 15 with that. I think that's in a table here. 16 Okay. Yes. 17 And when I say "lower," I mean lower in the sense that it's now closer to 1; correct? 18 19 That is correct. Α 20 And if we turn to, on Exhibit 1, to 0 21 table 2 in your report --22 Yes. I'm looking at that now. Α 23 Okay. Q -- does table 2 reflect the results of 24 the -- all of --25

Page 32 of 76

1 Well, strike that.

2 Let me ask you, what does table 2

3 reflect, in your words?

4 A Table 2 reflects we established four

5 | scenarios, which are listed in table 1.

6 | Scenario -- published with no nondetects

7 included. And then scenario 1 would be mean of

the duplicates; scenario 2, where we assigned

9 detection limit to nondetects; and scenario 3,

10 where we assigned 50 percent of the detection

11 limit.

8

15

16

17

18

19

And then table 2 represents the

calculated or computed geometric bias using

equation 1, which is on the first page of the

O Understood.

supplemental data sheet.

So looking at table 2, if we start there in the section of that table, that -- that states Tarawa Terrace supply wells --

20 Do you see that?

21 A Yes, I do.

22 Q Okay. So scenario zero is what was

23 | published in the A- -- the ATSDR reports, the

24 geometric bias. Correct?

25 A That is correct. It was important for

Page 33 of 76

1 us to -- to demonstrate the requirement of the

- scientific method reproducibility. 2
- 3 So what was published in the report or
- calculated originally for the Tarawa Terrace 4
- model was a geometric bias of 5.8; right?
- That is correct. 6 Α
- MS. BAUGHMAN:
- Object to the form. 8
- 9 MR. ANWAR:
- And scenario 1 is a recalculation of 10
- 11 the geometric bias where you're now averaging
- 12 samples taken within the same month but haven't
- 13 assigned a value to nondetects. Correct?
- 14 That is correct.
- 15 And the calculated geometric bias there
- 16 is 3.6; correct?
- 17 That is correct.
- MS. BAUGHMAN: 18
- 19 Object to the form. Object to the
- 2.0 form.
- 21 These questions are about the water
- 22 supply wells; right? I mean, there's two
- 23 different numbers.
- 24 MR. ANWAR:
- 25 I stated at the beginning of this line

1 of questioning that we're focusing on the section

- 2 of the table about the water supply wells, so I'd
- 3 | appreciate if you could stop interrupting and
- 4 | limit your objections to form. Thank you.
- 5 Q So, under scenario 1, the -- the model
- 6 | bias was calculated to be 3.6; correct?
- 7 MS. BAUGHMAN:
- 8 Object to the form.
- 9 A That is correct.
- 10 MR. ANWAR:
- 11 Q And based on our discussion of what
- 12 geometric values represent, 3.6 -- a geometric
- 13 | bias of 3.6 still represents the model
- 14 | overpredicting; correct?
- 15 A Overpredicting but closer to 1.
- 16 Q And, so, if we take a look at scenario
- 17 | 2 there under water supply wells, this scenario
- 18 now averages samples taken in the same month and
- 19 assigns the detection limit to -- to nondetect
- 20 | samples; correct?
- 21 A That is correct.
- 22 Q And the computed model bias there is
- 23 | 2.5; correct?
- 24 A That is correct.
- 25 Q Okay. And, so, based on our discussion

Page 35 of 76

Page 35 earlier, 2.5 is still greater than 1 and 1 represents that the model is overpredicting; 2 3 correct? That is correct. 4 And, then, scenario 3 there is 5 averaging the -- the samples taken within the 6 same month and then assigning half the detection limit to nondetect samples; correct? 8 9 А That is correct. And in computing the recalculating the 10 model bias, that resulted in a model bias of 3.4; 11 12 correct? 13 MS. BAUGHMAN: 14 Object to the form. 15 For scenario 3, yes. MR. ANWAR: 16 17 And a model bias of 3.4 represents the model overpredicting; correct? 18 19 Δ Yes 2.0 Okay. And, then, if we focus now on 21 the water treatment plant portion of table 2 just below the -- the water supply wells, you -- you 22

recalculated the geometric mean bias for the same

Α

23

24

25

Page 36 of 76

scenarios; correct?

Yes.

Page 36 1 Q Scenario zero is what's published in 2 the ATSDR report; correct? That is correct. 3 Α And, so, the geometric mean bias 4 published in the ATSDR report at the water 5 treatment plant, Tarawa Terrace water treatment 6 plant, is 1.5; correct? 8 That is correct. 9 And with a value above 1, the -- that 0 indicates the model is overpredicting; right? 10 11 That is correct. Α 12 0 Scenario 1 there --13 And I won't read that, repeat the 14 precise calculation. 15 But scenario 1 there was calculated to 16 have a geometric bias of 1.4; correct? 17 That is correct. 18 And 1.4 being greater than 1 indicates 19 that the model's overpredicting; right? 2.0 А Yes. 21 Now, scenario 2 there, where you -- you average the samples taken within the same month 22 23 and assign the detection limit to the nondetect 24 sampling values, that resulted in a recalculated geometric bias of .84. Correct? 25

Page 37 of 76

Page 37 1 Α That is correct. So scenario 2 there, now, indicates 2 3 that the model is underpredicting? Is that right? 4 5 Yes. And then scenario 3 is -- consists of 6 averaging the samples taken within the same month and assigning half the detection limit to the 8 9 value of nondetect samples; correct? That is correct. 10 Α 11 And the -- the recalculated geometric 0 12 bias there is 1.3. Right? 13 That is correct. Α 14 And being that 1.3 is a number greater 15 than 1, that indicates that the model is 16 overpredicting; right? 17 That is correct. 18 In the discussion in your report about 19 sort of recalculating the geometric bias for the 2.0 water supply wells in the water treatment plant 21 at Tarawa Terrace, did your calculations indicate 22 an improvement in the geometric bias? 23 For both the Tarawa Terrace water supply wells and the Tarawa Terrace water 24

treatment plant, the recalculations indicated an

25

Page 38 of 76

1 improved model bias, meaning closer to 1, than

- the original published values in the Tarawa 2
- 3 Terrace Chapter A report.
- Improved but still overpredicting; 4
- 5 right?
- Except for the one case in the TT water 6 Α
- treatment plant where you have it slightly below
- 8 But, yeah, that's -- that's correct.
- 9 O Understood.
- 10 Now, you're offering opinions about the
- 11 reliability -- reliability and accuracy of
- 12 ATSDR's water modeling efforts -- correct? -- in
- 13 this case?
- 14 Not -- not -- not in this document, no.
- 15 Okay. But in the -- in the case,
- 16 you've offered an expert -- you've offered an
- 17 expert report that you submitted in October 2023
- 18 and a rebuttal report that you submitted in
- 19 January 2025. Correct?
- 2.0 А That is correct.
- 21 And the opinions you offered in your
- 22 initial report and your rebuttal report, those
- 23 were based on calc- -- the original geometric
- bias calculations for the Tarawa Terrace model; 24
- 25 right?

Page 39 of 76

- 1 MS. BAUGHMAN:
- 2 Object to the form.
- 3 A That is correct.
- 4 MR. ANWAR:
- 5 Q And the corrections that we're now
- 6 discussing in your supplemental report to the
- 7 | geometric bias calculation, those aren't
- 8 reflected in your initial expert report or your
- 9 rebuttal expert report. Right?
- 10 A No, they were not.
- 11 Q Were these corrections to the geometric
- 12 bias considered at any point before submitting
- 13 your expert and rebuttal reports in this case?
- 14 MS. BAUGHMAN:
- 15 Object to form.
- 16 A No. No, they were not.
- 17 MR. ANWAR:
- 18 | O How come?
- 19 A At -- at the time, I was basing my
- 20 expert report on the work that I had previously
- 21 done and had previously been published, which
- 22 would have been the published ATSDR reports, and
- 23 I saw no reason to modify any of the assessments
- 24 in the ATSDR reports.
- Once I read, as we have discussed,

Page 40 of 76

- 1 | Dr. Konikow's report or rebuttal response to the
- 2 DOJ expert report where he mentioned the
- 3 | duplicate values and that we were doing monthly
- 4 | time steps, I felt he had a very valid point to
- 5 be made and thought we should at least initially
- 6 | see what impact that would have on the ge- --
- 7 calculated geometric biases.
- 8 Q And you testified earlier that you had
- 9 considered assigning values to a geometric bias
- 10 | when the Tarawa Terrace model was being
- 11 developed. Correct?
- 12 MS. BAUGHMAN:
- Object to the form.
- 14 | A Um, I'm not sure I quite understand the
- 15 question.
- 16 MR. ANWAR:
- 17 | Q Okay. I might have asked a bad
- 18 | question there. Let me -- let me reask it.
- So my understanding of your testimony
- 20 earlier in today's deposition was that when the
- 21 | Tarawa Terrace model was being developed and the
- 22 | initial calculation of the geometric bias for the
- 23 | Tarawa Terrace model was taking place, that there
- 24 was some discussion of assigning values to not --
- 25 | undetect samples. Is that right?

1 A Internal discussions, yes. Nothing

2 documented but just as -- as a team discussing

3 | model calibration, model results, how to assess

4 goodness of fit.

5 Q At the time that the model was being

6 developed, you and the -- the ATSDR water

7 | modeling team decided against assigning a value

to nondetect samples in calculating geometric

9 | bias. Correct?

10 A The final report reflects that, yes.

11 Q Why did Dr. Konikow's rebuttal

12 | report --

8

13 A Uh-huh.

14 Q -- now in the context of litigation,

15 change your mind about how the geometric bias

16 | should be calculated for the Tarawa Terrace

17 | model?

18 MS. BAUGHMAN:

19 Object to the form.

20 A I believe Dr. Konikow has substantial

21 expertise and experience with a wide variety of

22 | fate and transport models at different locations,

23 and I based it based on his expertise and

24 experience. I thought that would be a -- at

25 | least a good path to go down to at least reassess

Page 42 of 76

1 the data using his concept of taking a -- a mean.

- And we followed up with doing the non- --2
- assigning non- -- nondetects. 3
- MR. ANWAR: 4
- 5 Dr. Konikow participated in the 2005
- expert panel at ATSDR; right? 6
- That is correct. Α
- And Dr. Konikow also participated in 8
- 9 the 2009 ATSDR expert panel on the water
- 10 modeling; right?
- 11 That is correct. Α
- 12 And these corrections to the geometric
- 13 bias didn't come up at that time?
- MS. BAUGHMAN: 14
- 15 Object to form.
- I really don't recall. I would have to 16
- 17 go through the trans- -- the actual verbatim
- 18 transcripts, the --
- 19 I don't recall if they did or they did
- 2.0 At the time when we held the Tarawa Terrace
- 21 expert panel, I believe, in March 2005, we were
- 22 just in the, I would say, initial phases of
- 23 developing our approach to groundwater flow
- modeling and fate and transport modeling, so we 24
- 25 would not have had any final results to assess

Page 43 of 76

- 1 goodness of fit.
- 2 Q Isn't it true that you decided to
- 3 recalculate the geometric mean bias for the
- 4 | Tarawa Terrace model only after the model came
- 5 under scrutiny in this litigation?
- 6 MS. BAUGHMAN:
- 7 Object to the form.
- 8 A I wouldn't say that was the -- the
- 9 | primary focus. Again, focus was there's an
- 10 expert; in this case, Dr. Konikow. He's
- 11 | acknowledged by other people besides me as having
- 12 expertise in this area, and he mentioned -- he
- 13 didn't mention the model. He mentioned the
- 14 duplicate sampling data. Okay? And I recognized
- 15 that, yes, we had duplicate sampling data for
- 16 both the wells and the treatment plant. Perhaps
- 17 | we should test out his hypothesis.
- 18 MR. ANWAR:
- 19 Q Do you know, will ATSDR be correcting
- 20 the Tarawa Terrace water modeling reports based
- 21 on your geometric -- your corrected geometric
- 22 bias?
- 23 MS. BAUGHMAN:
- Object to the form. Outside the scope.
- I instruct you not to answer.

Page 44 of 76

Page 44 1 MR. ANWAR: 2 Again, disagree on being outside the 3 scope, and we'll preserve our right to keep the deposition open. 4 I'd like to mark as Exhibit 2 your 5 spreadsheet on the water supply wells. 6 Α Okay. Okay. Got it. 8 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NUMBER 2 9 WAS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) MR. ANWAR: 10 11 Okay. So I wanted to --12 MR. ANWAR: 13 Gio, could you just scroll down through all four pages quickly to show Mr. Maslia? 14 15 Okay. 16 Does this appear to be a true and 17 accurate copy of the spreadsheet that you --Yes, it does. 18 А 19 -- you submitted with your -- your 20 supplemental report about the water supply wells? 21 Yes, it does. Α 22 Okay. And these spreadsheets contain 23 the various scenarios for calculating geometric bias for the Tarawa Terrace model; right? 24 25 Α Yes. They should have titles in the

Page 45 of 76

Page 45 1 headers saying which scenario they are. Okay. So I just wanted to ask you a 2 few questions about this first page. This first 3 page reflects the calculations that were 4 performed and the geometric bias for the Tarawa 5 Terrace model as published by ATSDR; correct? 6 That is correct. Α And it looks like the first sample you 8 9 have there is from January of 1985 --So let me -- let me back up for a 10 11 Strike that. second. 12 There are -- there's data there listed for a few wells. I'm gonna focus our discussion 13 on TT23, TT25, and TT26. 14 15 Okay. 16 Focusing on TT26, it looks like the 17 first sample that you have there is from January 1985. Correct? 18 19 January 16th, yes, 1985. 2.0 Okay. And you -- you don't have any 0 21 samples, sampling data, prior to January 1985 for 22 the supply wells; correct? 23 That is correct. For --24 We're talking about TT26 still; right?

Q

25

Page 46 of 76

TT23.

Page 46 1 Α TT --2 Oh. I thought you said TT26. 3 sorry. I might have -- I apologize. I think 4 it's the same for TT26, for what it's worth. Okay. Could you clarify which well 6 Α we're talking about? 8 Yeah. Let's -- TT23. 9 Α Okay. 10 The first sample identified there is from January 16, 1985; correct? 11 12 Α Yes. 13 And there are -- you don't have any --14 you didn't have any sampling data prior to 15 January -- for the supply wells for TT23, prior 16 to January of 1985. Correct? 17 That is correct. Α And if you look at the observed values 18 19 there for sample 1 for TT23, the observed value 2.0 is 132. Correct? 21 Α Right. Yes. 22 And then it -- and then it goes down to 23 37, 26, nondetect, 14.9, and sort of fluctuates, but it goes down. Correct? 24 That is correct. 25 Α

```
Page 47
1
               The Tarawa Terrace -- the supply wells
     in Tarawa Terrace, these supply wells in Tarawa
2
    Terrace were shut down in January -- after
3
    January of 1985; correct?
4
    MS. BAUGHMAN:
5
6
               Object to the form.
7
               I believe the last one was shut down
    Α
8
    February.
9
    MR. ANWAR:
10
               Okay.
11
               Early February.
    Α
12
               Do you know which one that is?
13
               Um --
    Α
    MS. BAUGHMAN:
14
15
               I'm gonna object that that's outside
16
    the scope.
17
               I couldn't say without looking it up.
18
    MR. ANWAR:
19
               Okay. So, in any event, January or
20
    February, by February, the Tarawa Terrace supply
21
    wells here were shut down. Correct?
22
    MS. BAUGHMAN:
23
               Object to the form.
24
               Yes.
    MR. ANWAR:
25
```

Page 48 of 76

Page 48 1 And, so, the only values that were available, looking at TT23, TT25, TT26, while the 2 wells were operating, came from January or 3 February of 1985. 4 MS. BAUGHMAN: 5 6 Object to form. 7 For TT23, TT25, and TT26, yes. Yes. Α 8 That's correct. 9 MR. ANWAR: Isn't it fair to say that you only had 10 11 samples -- one or two samples for each of these wells prior -- while the -- the wells were 12 13 operating? MS. BAUGHMAN: 14 Object to the form. 15 There were limited -- limited data 16 17 during operations. MR. ANWAR: 18 19 Limited such that you -- you only had 20 sampling data from January 1985 or maybe February 21 1985, before the -- the wells were shut down; 22 correct? 23 Yes. 24 Now, if we turn to the third page of 25 the spreadsheet, this is the -- these are the

Page 49 of 76

1 | calculations for the geometric bias based on the

- 2 use of half the detection limit and averaging of
- 3 | samples in the same month. Correct?
- 4 A I believe these are the -- using the
- 5 | nondetects equals the detection limit, not half
- 6 | the detection limit.
- 7 Q Oh. I understand. I'm on the wrong
- 8 page. I'm sorry. You're right.
- 9 So these are -- these are averaging
- 10 samples taken in the same month and using the
- 11 detection limit for nondetect values and
- 12 | calculating the geometric mean bias. Correct?
- 13 A That is correct.
- 14 Q Okay. And, so, on the first page
- 15 there, as published by ATSDR, the geometric bias
- 16 was calculated to 5.81, roughly. Correct?
- 17 A Well, just a minute. 5.8, yes. Yes.
- 18 Q Okay. And then if we go back to page
- 19 3, the geometric bias was calculated to be --
- 20 | based on averaging the samples and using the
- 21 detection limit for nondetects, the geometric
- 22 | bias for the Tarawa Terrace model was calculated
- 23 to be 2.46. Correct?
- 24 A That is correct.
- 25 | Q So the -- the geometric bias went down,

Page 50 of 76

Page 50 1 but it's still overpredicting; right? Yes. It was -- it became -- it was 2 closer to 1 than the original calculation. 3 Understood. 4 And based on our discussion earlier, my 5 understanding is that a geometric bias closer to 6 1 indicates a better goodness of fit. Is that 8 right? 9 Α Yes. Okay. Which you agreed earlier that 10 geometric bias isn't the only way to evaluate the 11 goodness of fit or the accuracy of a model; 12 13 right? 14 That is correct. 15 Another way to evaluate the -- the 16 goodness of fit or the accuracy of the model is 17 qualitatively; correct? MS. BAUGHMAN: 18 19 You can answer "yes" or "no." 2.0 Α Yes. 21 MR. ANWAR: And if -- if we look at your 22 23 calculations here, starting with --24 Let's look at TT23, for example. Starting in January of 1985, when the well was 25

```
Page 51
1
     still operating, the simulated value for the
2
    Tarawa Terrace model was 253 compared to the
    observed value being 132. Correct?
3
               I -- it's 254 on the spreadsheet.
4
    you're looking at the top row, sample number 1,
5
    simulated is 254.0.
6
               You're right there. So it's 2 --
     sample 1 is 254 for simulated, 132 for observed.
8
9
    Correct?
               That is correct.
10
    Α
11
               And, then, samples 2, 3, 4 there,
    simulate is 2- -- simulated is 253. Observed
12
13
    is --
14
    Α
               Right.
15
               -- 24.4. Correct?
16
               Those are mean -- that's a mean value,
17
    the observed.
               Understood. But it's, for 2, 3, and 4,
18
     253 mean value simulated and 24.4 observed;
19
2.0
    correct?
21
               That is correct.
    Α
22
               Example 5, 6, and 7, now, this is after
23
    the wells have been shut down. The simulated
    value is 265 --
24
25
    Α
               Right.
```

Page 52 1 -- compared to an observed value of 29.875. Correct? 2 3 That is correct. And if we walk through just a sample --4 just for TT23, samples 9, 10, and 11, the 5 simulated values, respectively, are 274, 279, 6 191. Correct? 8 That is correct. 9 And the observed values there are 10, 0 4, and 10; correct? 10 11 Α Yes. So even though the geometric bias went 12 down, but it's still above 1, what is -- what is 13 14 the -- what do these concentration values here 15 tell you qualitatively about the goodness of fit? 16 MS. BAUGHMAN: 17 Object to the form. It tells me -- it tells me that the 18 Α 19 model's doing what we would expect it to do but 2.0 at a slower rate, reducing the concentration once 21 the wells are shut down. 22 But, again, the model is using monthly 23 time -- time -- time steps rather than instantaneous value that's recorded as the 24 25 observed sample. So, in my opinion, the model's

Page 53 of 76

Page 53 1 behaving correctly. 2 MR. ANWAR: And with or without the corrections for 3 the geometric bias at the TT water supply wells 4 5 and the TT water treatment plant, the -- the -the model is still overpredicting; right? 6 It's -- it has a geometric bias of Α 8 greater than 1, so it is over- -- overpredicting. 9 Okay. 10 There is no standard, published or 11 otherwise, to tell you what a geometric bias 12 should be. 13 MR. ANWAR: 14 Gio, could you pull up Chapter F really 15 quick? Let's mark that as Exhibit 3 and go to 16 page F33. 17 (DEPOSITION EXHIBIT NUMBER 3 WAS MARKED FOR IDENTIFICATION.) 18 19 MS. BAUGHMAN: 2.0 Can I ask the court reporter what the 21 time is? 22 VIDEOGRAPHER: 23 Yeah. We're at an hour. 24 MS. BAUGHMAN: 25 Can you hear me?

Page 54 of 76

Page 54 1 VIDEOGRAPHER: We're at one hour. 2 MR. ANWAR: 3 4 Last question. So this is a section of Chapter F, 5 0 looking on the right-hand side, F33, that -- that 6 discusses the geometric bias for the water supply 8 wells. 9 Now, at the top of the -- starting at the top of the paragraph on the right-hand side, 10 it says "of the total of 36 comparisons simulated 11 12 observed PC concentrations in all water supply 13 wells used to calculate the TT fate and transport 14 model, including nondetected results, 17 15 comparisons, or 47 percent, conform to the calibration standard, and 19 comparisons, or 53 16 17 percent, violated the standard." 18 Does anything about recalculating the 19 geometric mean change what's stated there in the 2.0 report? 21 As we have --MS. BAUGHMAN: 22 23 Object to the form. And it's outside 24 the scope.

25

Page 55 of 76

Go ahead.

I'll let you answer, Morris.

1 As -- as we have -- as was discussed in the 2009 expert panel report, the, I guess, 2 philosophy is not to use calibration standards. 3 It's a good tool to internally start getting --4 to see where your calibration is heading. 5 And, so, I would -- I would say that 6 7 the report states what we did at the time, published in 2007. 8 9 If I were to go back and look again today, we probably would not use a calibration 10 11 standard as suggested by our expert panel. MR. ANWAR: 12 13 I will, given that we're at the 14 hour, that will be my last question. 15 I would just note for the record that 16 the -- the witness was instructed not to -- to 17 answer multiple questions that we believe were in

speaking objections, and we -- we reserve our right to keep this deposition open and seek all

further relief from the court.

MS. BAUGHMAN:

I just have a couple of quick follow-up questions.

the scope of the deposition, in addition to the

25

18

21

22

23

24

## 1 EXAMINATION

- 2 BY MS. BAUGHMAN:
- 3 Q Yeah. I just had a couple of quick
- 4 questions.
- 5 Mr. Maslia, when you look at your
- 6 | supplemental report that's been marked as Exhibit
- 7 | 1, you provided data regarding the water
- 8 treatment plant for Tarawa Terrace and the water
- 9 | supply wells regarding model bias.
- 10 When you're assessing the reliability
- 11 of the -- of the model, which is more important
- 12 to your assessment? The water treatment plant
- geometric bias or the water supply wells?
- 14 A It's the water treatment plant,
- 15 because, as explained to us by study
- 16 | epidemiologists, the exposure starts at the point
- 17 closest to where someone is exposed to drinking
- 18 water. That would be the water treatment plant,
- 19 the treated water at the water treatment plant.
- 20 They were not exposed to water supplied by water
- 21 supply wells.
- 22 | Q Okay. And just another question. You
- 23 | were asked several questions about the -- the
- 24 results as -- the simulated values and the
- 25 observed values for TT23.

1 Α Uh-huh.

And with the original chapter reports 2

published by ATSDR, there were two different 3

geometric biases provided, one with and one 4

without TT23. Why was TT23 treated separately? 5

TT23, based on the records we had, was 6 Α

only operated for possibly seven months, eight

months, at most; whereas TT26 and the other wells

9 had a much longer operational record. And, so,

we -- we thought that might have some impact on 10

11 the well -- on the analysis of model of geometric

12 bias by using that short -- short period.

13 Thank you. No further questions.

MR. ANWAR: 14

8

15 Thank you. Nothing from me.

16 VIDEOGRAPHER:

17 The time is 1:03. We're off the

18 record.

19 (OFF THE RECORD.)

2.0 THE COURT REPORTER:

21 Does the DOJ need a rough draft?

22 MR. ANWAR:

23 Sure.

24 (Deposition concluded at 1:03 p.m. EST)

25

Page 58 of 76

## CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the above and foregoing transcript of proceedings in the matter aforementioned was taken down by me in machine shorthand, and the questions and answers thereto were reduced to writing under my personal supervision, and that the foregoing represents a true and correct transcript of the proceedings given by said witness upon said hearing.

I further certify that I am neither of counsel nor of kin to the parties to the action, nor am I in anywise interested in the result of said cause.

Lois anne Robinsin.

LOIS ANNE ROBINSON, RPR, RMR
REGISTERED DIPLOMATE REPORTER
CERTIFIED REALTIME REPORTER

877-370-3377

[& - account] Page 1

&	<b>16</b> 46:11	<b>24.4.</b> 51:15	<b>5.8</b> 23:9 33:5
	<b>16th</b> 45:19	<b>25</b> 15:20	49:17
<b>&amp;</b> 2:3	<b>17</b> 54:14	<b>253</b> 51:2,12,19	<b>5.81</b> 49:16
0	<b>19</b> 54:16	<b>254</b> 51:4,8	<b>50</b> 28:11 30:5
01-00000930	<b>191</b> 52:7	<b>254.0.</b> 51:6	32:10
3:12	<b>1985</b> 45:9,18,19	<b>26</b> 46:23	<b>53</b> 3:11 54:16
1	45:21 46:11,16	<b>265</b> 51:24	<b>56</b> 3:4
<b>1</b> 3:7 8:9,11	47:4 48:4,20	<b>274</b> 52:6	6
9:17 11:1,6	48:21 50:25	<b>279</b> 52:6	_
16:10,22 17:16	<b>1999</b> 7:6	<b>29.875.</b> 52:2	
25:12,12,25	<b>1:03</b> 57:17,24	<b>29th</b> 1:16 4:5	7
31:18,20 32:5	2	<b>2nd</b> 2:3	<b>7</b> 51:22
32:7,14 33:10	<b>2</b> 3:9 31:21,24	3	<b>700</b> 2:3
34:5,15 35:1	32:2,4,8,12,17	<b>3</b> 3:11 32:9	<b>7:23</b> 1:4 4:9
36:9,12,15,18	34:17 35:21	35:5,15 37:6	8
37:15 38:1,8	36:21 37:2	49:19 51:11,18	8 3:7
46:19 50:3,7	44:5,8 51:7,11	53:15,17	<b>84</b> 36:25
51:5,8 52:13	51:12,18	<b>3.4</b> 35:11,17	<b>897</b> 1:4 4:9
53:8 56:7	<b>2.46.</b> 49:23	<b>3.6</b> 33:16 34:6	9
<b>1.0</b> 30:7	<b>2.5</b> 34:23 35:1	34:12,13	9 27:17 52:5
<b>1.3</b> 37:14	<b>20044</b> 2:9	<b>3.9</b> 23:13	27717 6276
<b>1.3.</b> 37:12	<b>2005</b> 42:5,21	<b>340</b> 2:9	a
<b>1.4</b> 36:16,18	<b>2007</b> 55:8	<b>36</b> 15:19 54:11	<b>a.m.</b> 4:6
<b>1.5</b> 23:18 36:7	<b>2009</b> 42:9 55:2	<b>37</b> 46:23	<b>a10</b> 27:19 28:2
<b>10</b> 52:5,9,10	<b>2023</b> 38:17	4	29:4
<b>10003</b> 2:4	<b>2024</b> 5:18	_	<b>a9</b> 3:10 28:2
11 52:5	<b>2025</b> 1:17 4:6	4 20:22 51:11	29:4
<b>114</b> 3:12	5:17 9:21	51:18 52:10	<b>above</b> 28:19
<b>11:58</b> 1:18 4:6	13:14 38:19	<b>44</b> 3:9 <b>47</b> 54:15	29:8 36:9
<b>132</b> 46:20 51:3	<b>2067</b> 58:18		52:13 58:3
51:8	<b>24</b> 9:21	5	accompanied
<b>14.9</b> 46:23	<b>24.4</b> 51:19	<b>5</b> 3:3 51:22	6:18
			account 23:5

	T	I	I
accuracy 12:2	<b>air</b> 7:21	40:16 42:4	assessing 9:17
14:17 18:2	<b>alex</b> 2:14	43:18 44:1,10	56:10
38:11 50:12,16	allow 28:5	44:12 47:9,18	assessment
accurate 8:25	allowed 20:20	47:25 48:9,18	56:12
44:17	allowing 20:24	50:21 53:2,13	assessments
acknowledged	<b>allows</b> 14:16,18	54:3 55:12	39:23
43:11	alternative	57:14,22	assign 36:23
<b>action</b> 58:12	21:5	anywise 58:13	assigned 11:20
actual 5:22	alternatively	apologize 46:4	28:23 29:19,21
12:11 13:21	18:14	appear 44:16	29:24 30:11
16:16,25 17:23	america 4:10	appearing 4:15	32:8,10 33:13
20:1 28:19	analysis 6:11	<b>apply</b> 5:16	assigning 28:9
42:17	29:14 30:9,20	appreciate 34:3	28:22 29:14
addition 55:18	57:11	approach	30:13,24 35:7
additional	<b>anne</b> 2:20	42:23	37:8 40:9,24
21:17	58:18	appropriate	41:7 42:3
additionally	<b>answer</b> 18:16	17:3	assignment
11:2	18:25 19:7	approximately	31:4
addresses	20:13 22:25	1:18	assigns 34:19
21:24	25:6 43:25	april 9:21	<b>assist</b> 10:5,8
aforemention	50:19 54:25	arbitrarily	assume 15:8
58:5	55:17	29:14	<b>atsdr</b> 6:24 7:14
afternoon 5:6,7	answers 58:6	<b>area</b> 43:12	15:1 24:11
<b>agree</b> 19:20	anticipated	<b>article</b> 7:2,3,5	25:21 32:23
24:13,17 31:14	10:2	aside 6:21	36:2,5 39:22
31:14	antonucci 2:11	12:18	39:24 41:6
agreed 4:15	8:16	<b>asked</b> 10:14	42:6,9 43:19
21:17 50:10	<b>anwar</b> 2:10 3:3	20:23 21:5	45:6 49:15
agreement	5:5,9 8:13,19	40:17 56:23	57:3
16:23 17:8	18:17 19:12,19	assess 7:23	atsdr's 13:2
20:24	20:14 21:7	16:2 18:2 19:5	17:8 25:15
<b>ahead</b> 8:9 30:6	22:17 25:13,22	19:14 29:5	38:12
54:25	33:9,24 34:10	41:3 42:25	attorney 11:22
	35:16 39:4,17		
L	1	I .	

42:14 43:6,23	33:5,11,15	27:10,23 31:7
47:5,14,22	34:6,13,22	32:13 33:4,15
48:5,14 50:18	35:11,11,17,23	34:6 36:15
52:16 53:19,24	36:4,16,25	40:7 41:16
54:22 55:22	37:12,19,22	49:16,19,22
56:2	38:1,24 39:7	calculating
beginning	39:12 40:9,22	29:8 41:8
33:25	41:9,15 42:13	44:23 49:12
behaving 53:1	43:3,22 44:24	calculation
<b>believe</b> 7:12,13	45:5 49:1,12	14:16 28:16,24
10:19 13:19	49:15,19,22,25	36:14 39:7
27:2,17 29:2	50:6,11 52:12	40:22 50:3
30:4 41:20	53:4,7,11 54:7	calculations
42:21 47:7	56:9,13 57:12	13:1,6,10,15
49:4 55:17	biases 31:7	37:21 38:24
<b>ben</b> 2:9	40:7 57:4	45:4 49:1
<b>best</b> 29:3	<b>bit</b> 14:14	50:23
better 50:7	<b>bolton</b> 2:5	calibration
<b>bias</b> 6:10 7:8	<b>bottom</b> 9:14	16:3 41:3
10:24 13:2,6	<b>boulevard</b> 22:7	54:16 55:3,5
13:10 14:14,15	22:12,22 23:5	55:10
15:11,14,15,23	<b>box</b> 2:9	<b>camp</b> 1:6 4:8
16:2,9,22	<b>briefly</b> 4:17	14:25
17:15 18:1	broadway 2:3	carolina 1:2
19:4,13 21:2	c	4:12
21:25 22:2,6	c 2:1 10:25.25	case 5:11 6:15
22:11,20 23:8	·	7:8 8:1,3,10
23:11,16 24:1	· ·	9:2 11:23
24:18 26:6,19		15:19 38:6,13
		38:15 39:13
27:1,10,23	54:13	
28:5,11,16,24	54:13 <b>calculated</b> 16:2	43:10
28:5,11,16,24 29:5,9,18 30:9	calculated 16:2	43:10 <b>cases</b> 1:8
28:5,11,16,24		43:10
	47:5,14,22 48:5,14 50:18 52:16 53:19,24 54:22 55:22 56:2 beginning 33:25 behaving 53:1 believe 7:12,13 10:19 13:19 27:2,17 29:2 30:4 41:20 42:21 47:7 49:4 55:17 ben 2:9 best 29:3 better 50:7 bias 6:10 7:8 10:24 13:2,6 13:10 14:14,15 15:11,14,15,23 16:2,9,22 17:15 18:1 19:4,13 21:2 21:25 22:2,6 22:11,20 23:8 23:11,16 24:1 24:18 26:6,19	47:5,14,22 48:5,14 50:18 52:16 53:19,24 54:22 55:22 56:2 38:1,24 39:7  beginning 33:25 behaving 53:1 believe 7:12,13 10:19 13:19 27:2,17 29:2 30:4 41:20 42:21 47:7 49:4 55:17 ben 2:9 best 29:3 better 50:7 bias 6:10 7:8 10:24 13:2,6 13:10 14:14,15 15:11,14,15,23 16:2,9,22 17:15 18:1 19:4,13 21:2 21:25 22:2,6 22:11,20 23:8 23:11,16 24:1 24:18 26:6,19  34:6,13,22 35:11,11,1,7,23 36:4,16,25 37:12,19,22 38:1,24 39:7 39:12 40:9,22 41:9,15 42:13 45:5 49:1,12 49:15,19,22,25 50:6,11 52:12 53:4,7,11 54:7 56:9,13 57:12 biases 31:7 40:7 57:4 bit 14:14 bottom 2:5 bottom 9:14 boulevard 22:7 22:12,22 23:5 box 2:9 briefly 4:17 broadway 2:3  c c c 2:1 10:25,25 58:1,1 calc 38:23 calculate 28:4

[certified - court] Page 4

certified 58:19	compare 19:24	contents 10:9	36:16,17,25
certify 58:3,11	compared 51:2	context 41:14	37:1,9,10,13,17
change 41:15	52:1	continue 18:25	38:8,12,19,20
54:19	comparisons	25:25	39:3 40:11
changed 12:12	54:11,15,16	continues	41:9 42:7,11
chapter 6:25	completely	21:10	45:6,7,18,22,23
17:9 23:24,25	4:19	<b>control</b> 7:8 8:1	46:11,16,17,20
27:17 38:3	compute 7:25	8:3	46:24,25 47:4
53:14 54:5	computed	conversation	47:21 48:8,22
57:2	27:19 32:13	30:5	49:3,12,13,16
<b>chat</b> 8:15	34:22	<b>copy</b> 8:22,25	49:23,24 50:14
<b>cite</b> 7:9	computing	9:5,8,10 14:2	50:17 51:3,9
<b>cited</b> 7:11,12	29:5 35:10	44:17	51:10,15,20,21
7:13	concentration	<b>correct</b> 5:11,12	52:2,3,7,8,10
clarification	16:17 52:14,20	8:3 9:5,19,20	58:9
15:25	concentrations	9:22,25 12:23	corrected 43:21
clarify 46:6	16:6 17:21	12:24 13:4,7,8	correcting
<b>clja</b> 3:12	24:3,5,14,19,21	13:11,12 14:6	43:19
<b>close</b> 25:11	54:12	15:6,7 16:11	correction
<b>closer</b> 31:6,18	concept 42:1	16:12,18 17:18	26:23 30:2
34:15 38:1	concluded	17:25 22:1,12	corrections
50:3,6	57:24	23:9,10,14,15	31:1 39:5,11
closest 56:17	conclusion 29:2	23:18,19,23	42:12 53:3
<b>coded</b> 12:9	<b>conform</b> 54:15	26:7,8,11,21,22	correctly 11:3
<b>coding</b> 12:10	consider 23:4	27:11 29:19,20	53:1
collected 26:14	28:22	29:22,23,25	correctness
<b>come</b> 15:22	considered	30:1 31:8,18	12:3
39:18 42:13	39:12 40:9	31:19 32:24,25	counsel 4:20
comes 29:10	considering	33:6,13,14,16	58:12
<b>coming</b> 17:22	27:20	33:17 34:6,9	<b>couple</b> 55:23
commencing	consists 37:6	34:14,20,21,23	56:3
1:17	contain 44:22	34:24 35:3,4,8	court 1:1 2:21
comment 24:25	contaminant	35:9,12,18,24	4:11,22 5:22
	7:22	36:2,3,7,8,11	20:21,25 21:20

[court - effect] Page 5

21:21 53:20	8:11 13:13	disagree 17:11	<b>dr</b> 10:12 11:9
55:21 57:20	14:1 18:10	18:21 20:15	11:24 12:1,5
<b>crr</b> 2:20	20:16,19 21:12	25:15,17,20	12:15,19,19
current 27:24	21:14,17 40:20	44:2	26:24 30:3,12
currently 6:4	44:4,8 53:17	discussed 24:18	40:1 41:11,20
8:18	55:18,20 57:24	39:25 55:1	42:5,8 43:10
<b>cv</b> 1:4 4:9	depositions	discusses 7:7	draft 10:3
d	5:10,17 14:24	54:7	57:21
<b>d</b> 3:1	21:4	discussing 39:6	drafting 10:5,7
<b>d.c.</b> 2:9	describe 26:6	41:2	drinking 56:17
data 9:18 16:17	detection 11:11	discussion	<b>drop</b> 8:15
16:20,25 17:23	11:16,17 27:21	11:14 13:23	<b>due</b> 4:16
20:1,9 28:15	28:12,12,19	34:11,25 37:18	<b>duly</b> 5:1
32:15 42:1	29:8,11,22,25	40:24 45:13	duplicate 26:7
43:14,15 45:12	30:6,7 32:9,10	50:5	26:9 27:4,16
45:21 46:14	34:19 35:7	discussions	27:19 40:3
48:16,20 56:7	36:23 37:8	29:1 41:1	43:14,15
date 4:5	49:2,5,6,11,21	dispersion 7:21	duplicates
dated 9:21	determine 20:9	district 1:1,2	30:23 32:8
davis 12:1,5,16	developed	4:10,11	dynamic 12:11
12:19	28:25 40:11,21	divided 10:25	e
day 1:16 26:15	41:6	division 1:3	e 2:1,1 3:1 58:1
<b>dbolton</b> 2:6	developing	document 1:7	58:1
deanna 2:14	10:9 42:23	13:20 17:2	earlier 13:14
decided 41:7	devin 2:5	18:10 20:22	35:1 40:8,20
43:2	different 7:20	38:14	50:5,10
defendant 2:7	30:10,24 33:23	documented	early 47:11
demonstrate	41:22 57:3	41:2	early 47.11 easier 13:24
33:1	difficult 13:22	documents 6:8	eastern 1:2
department 2:8	diplomate	<b>doing</b> 40:3 42:2	4:11,11
deponent 4:13	58:19	52:19	edited 11:7
deposition 1:14	directly 17:8	<b>doj</b> 6:9 20:23	effect 30:18
· GCBUUILIUI I.IT	10.22 10.1	27:3 40:2	30.10
_	18:22 19:1	27.3 40.2	
4:7,14 5:15	27:24	57:21	

[efforts - formula] Page 6

efforts 38:12	51:22	f	19:14 20:6,10
<b>eight</b> 57:7	excel 12:2	<b>f</b> 23:24,25	29:6 41:4 43:1
<b>either</b> 26:12,14	13:23	53:14 54:5	50:7,12,16
ensure 4:18	except 38:6	58:1	52:15
entitled 9:17	excluded 28:4	<b>f33</b> 53:16 54:6	floor 2:3
<b>epi</b> 8:3	28:16	fact 21:2	<b>flow</b> 42:23
epidemiologi	excluding	fair 17:13,14	fluctuates
7:8 8:1	27:10,23	48:10	46:23
epidemiologi	<b>exhibit</b> 3:7,9,11	far 26:16	<b>focus</b> 14:24
56:16	8:9,11 9:17	<b>fate</b> 7:22 16:3	35:20 43:9,9
equalling 16:22	25:25 31:20	41:22 42:24	45:13
equals 11:1	44:5,8 53:15	54:13	focusing 34:1
49:5	53:17 56:6	february 47:8	45:16
equation 32:14	exhibits 3:6	47:11,20,20	<b>folks</b> 8:17
equivalent	<b>expect</b> 52:19	48:4,20	<b>follow</b> 13:22,24
15:16	experience	feedback 10:15	55:23
esq 2:4,5	41:21,24	10:17 11:10	followed 42:2
<b>esquire</b> 2:10,11	<b>expert</b> 27:3,3	12:4,7,15	follows 5:3
<b>est</b> 1:18 57:24	38:16,17 39:8	<b>feel</b> 9:7 25:24	foregoing 58:4
established	39:9,13,20	felix 7:6	58:8
32:4	40:2 42:6,9,21	<b>felt</b> 13:21 40:4	<b>form</b> 24:23
estimated	43:10 55:2,11	<b>field</b> 14:20,20	25:2,19 33:8
17:20	expertise 41:21	files 12:2	33:19,20 34:4
evaluate 19:21	41:23 43:12	<b>final</b> 41:10	34:8 35:14
20:10 50:11,15	explained	42:25	39:2,15 40:13
evaluating 20:6	26:13 56:15	<b>first</b> 4:25 9:23	41:19 42:15
<b>event</b> 47:19	exposed 56:17	10:24 27:15	43:7,24 47:6
<b>exact</b> 16:23	56:20	32:14 45:3,3,8	47:23 48:6,15
17:4,7,7	exposure 56:16	45:17 46:10	52:17 54:23
examination	exposures 7:25	49:14	<b>formal</b> 13:20
3:2 5:4 56:1	expressed	<b>fit</b> 7:24 9:17	<b>format</b> 14:11
examined 5:2	15:11	11:3 14:19	14:12
example 7:20		16:3 18:2 19:5	formula 28:4
10:23 50:24			28:11

Golkow Technologies,
A Veritext Division

Document 425-3 Filed 07/03/25

0 7 10 15	0.5.4.5.5.	1	1 10 4004
formulas 12:10	36:4,16,25	47:15	halfway 10:24
12:12,12	37:11,19,22	<b>good</b> 5:6,7	<b>hand</b> 14:11,11
foundation	38:23 39:7,11	30:20 41:25	54:6,10
25:19	40:7,9,22 41:8	55:4	handling 26:16
<b>four</b> 21:1 32:4	41:15 42:12	goodness 14:19	handwritten
44:14	43:3,21,21	16:3 18:2 19:5	9:11,12 13:21
franklin 2:9	44:23 45:5	19:14 20:6,10	14:2 21:14
<b>free</b> 9:7 25:24	49:1,12,15,19	41:4 43:1 50:7	<b>hard</b> 12:9,10
<b>front</b> 24:8	49:21,25 50:6	50:12,16 52:15	haroon 2:10
further 55:21	50:11 52:12	<b>great</b> 7:19 8:21	5:9
57:13 58:11	53:4,7,11 54:7	25:12	haroon.anwar
g	54:19 56:13	greater 17:15	2:10
ge 40:6	57:4,11	25:12 35:1	<b>havai</b> 2:14
generally 14:14	getting 55:4	36:18 37:14	headers 45:1
15:3 16:14	<b>gio</b> 8:14 44:13	53:8	heading 55:5
20:5	53:14	groundmodel	hear 24:24
	giovanni 2:11	19:22	53:25
<b>geometric</b> 6:11 7:7 13:2,6,10	giovanni.ant	groundwater	<b>heard</b> 4:18
14:14,15 15:11	2:11	15:3 16:10,24	hearing 58:10
15:22 16:2,9	<b>given</b> 55:13	17:17 19:14,22	<b>held</b> 4:8 42:20
16:22 17:15	58:10	19:25 20:6	<b>hey</b> 8:17
18:1 19:4,4,13	<b>go</b> 5:14 8:9	42:23	<b>higher</b> 17:22
· · ·	18:24 21:19	<b>group</b> 6:9	holcombe 22:7
21:2,25 22:2,6 22:10,20 23:8	30:6 41:25	<b>guess</b> 16:13	22:12,21 23:5
<u>'</u>	42:17 49:18	17:7 18:18	hour 20:25
23:11,16 24:1 24:18 26:5,19	53:15 54:25	55:2	53:23 54:2
27:1,10,22	55:9	h	55:14
28:5,11,16,24	goes 46:22,24	hadnot 22:7,11	<b>huh</b> 41:13 57:1
29:5,9,18 30:9	<b>going</b> 15:1,2	22:21 23:4	hypothesis
30:19 31:5,6,7	golkow 4:4	half 11:17	43:17
32:13,24 33:5	<b>gonna</b> 5:14	29:25 35:7	i
,	18:9,15 19:3		identical 26:10
33:11,15 34:12	20:15 21:8	37:8 49:2,5	identical 20:10
34:12 35:23	22:18 45:13		
	I.	ahnalagias	

	T		
identification	instance 17:21	<b>journal</b> 7:2,3,5	legible 14:11
8:12 9:13 44:9	20:7	8:7	<b>lejeune</b> 1:6 4:8
53:18	instantaneous	<b>judge</b> 18:24	14:25
identified	52:24	justice 2:8	lettering 9:13
46:10	instruct 18:15	k	<b>limit</b> 11:16,18
<b>impact</b> 30:18	43:25	keep 20:16	18:19 21:8
40:6 57:10	instructed	21:11 44:3	22:18 27:21
important 5:20	55:16	55:20	28:12,13,20
19:20,24 32:25	instructing	key 27:15	29:8,11,22,25
56:11	18:25 20:13	kin 58:12	30:7,7 32:9,11
improved 38:1	interested	kind 7:20	34:4,19 35:8
38:4	58:13	know 7:11 8:23	36:23 37:8
improvement	internal 29:1	11:18 21:9	49:2,5,6,11,21
37:22	41:1	25:11 28:12	limited 5:13
include 28:18	internally 55:4	29:12 30:15	18:10,12 48:16
29:6,7,15	interrupting	43:19 47:12	48:16,19
included 28:8	34:3	known 21:3	<b>limits</b> 11:11
32:7	introducing	konikow 10:12	line 33:25
including 54:14	29:13	11:9,24 12:19	<b>list</b> 29:3
indicate 23:21	<b>issue</b> 21:10	26:24 30:3,12	listed 32:5
24:2,2 37:21	issues 26:1	41:20 42:5,8	45:12
indicated 37:25	j	43:10	literally 26:10
indicates 16:10	<b>j</b> 2:4 7:5	konikow's 40:1	litigation 1:6
16:23 17:16	james 2:18 4:3	41:11	4:9 11:25
36:10,18 37:2	<b>january</b> 38:19	1	14:24 41:14
37:15 50:7	45:9,17,19,21		43:5
individual 7:25	46:11,15,16	1 9:23	<b>little</b> 14:13
15:16 26:17	47:3,4,19 48:3	language 17:8	locations 41:22
initial 27:13	48:20 50:25	laura 2:4	lois 2:20 4:22
38:22 39:8	jeff 12:1	law 5:22	58:18
40:22 42:22	jones 12:1,5,15	lawyers 12:18	longer 14:4
initially 26:25	12:19	lbaughman 2:5	57:9
27:12,14 28:7	12.17	legal 6:9	look 11:4 34:16
40:5			46:18 50:22,24

55:9 56:5	27:5,14 30:23	27:25 28:25	<b>months</b> 57:7,8
looking 11:16	31:17 32:7	29:5 30:10	morris 1:15
11:18 31:22	33:22 35:23	33:5 34:5,13	4:13,24 9:23
32:17 47:17	36:4 42:1 43:3	34:22 35:2,11	54:25
48:2 51:5 54:6	49:12 51:16,16	35:11,17,18	multiple 26:20
looks 45:8,16	51:19 54:19	36:10 37:3,15	55:17
<b>lower</b> 16:16,19	meaning 38:1	38:1,24 40:10	n
31:6,17,17	measured	40:21,23 41:3	<b>n</b> 2:1 3:1
luxenberg 2:3	15:12 16:20	41:3,5,17 43:4	name 4:3 5:9
m	<b>mention</b> 43:13	43:4,13 44:24	nature 4:16
machine 58:5	mentioned 40:2	45:6 49:22	necessarily
made 21:21	43:12,13	50:12,16 51:2	17:11 28:7
40:5	<b>met</b> 5:9	52:22 53:6	need 11:4 20:9
march 5:17	method 33:2	54:14 56:9,11	21:19 57:21
13:13 42:21	<b>methods</b> 18:5,7	57:11	neither 58:11
mark 8:9 44:5	21:6	<b>model's</b> 36:19	new 2:4,4
53:15	<b>mind</b> 8:20	52:19,25	nice 5:8
marked 8:12	41:15	modeling 38:12	non 42:2,3
44:9 53:18	<b>minute</b> 49:17	41:7 42:10,24	nondetect
56:6	<b>model</b> 6:10 7:7	42:24 43:20	11:20 27:11,23
maslia 1:15	7:20,21,22,23	models 14:25	28:3,9,15
4:13,24 5:6	7:24 9:17	15:3 41:22	29:19 30:13
8:22 9:24	10:24 11:2,6	moderate 24:15	31:4 34:19
18:16,25 19:3	11:19 13:3	moderately	35:8 36:23
20:21 21:4,23	14:17,19 15:2	24:3,19	37:9 41:8
22:20 44:14	15:14,15 16:1	<b>modify</b> 39:23	46:23 49:11
56:5	16:4,5,10,15,24	moment 24:9	nondetected
match 17:4	16:24 17:16,17	<b>month</b> 26:15,20	54:14
materials 6:6	17:20,22 18:3	27:5 31:3	nondetects
matter 4:8	19:5,15,22,25	33:12 34:18	28:23 29:3
14:20,20 58:4	20:7,8 22:1,2,8	35:7 36:22	30:11,24 32:6
mean 6:11	22:12,22 23:7	37:7 49:3,10	32:9 33:13
16:15 26:10	23:22 24:1	monthly 27:6	42:3 49:5,21
10.13 20.10	26:4,5 27:1,9	40:3 52:22	72.3 77.3,21
	-	ahmala sias	

			1
<b>norm</b> 12:1	22:19 34:4	47:19 49:14,18	overall 16:20
<b>north</b> 1:2 4:12	55:19	50:10 53:9	overpredicted
<b>note</b> 18:22	observations	55:13 56:22	24:4,20
20:15 55:15	20:10	omitting 23:12	overpredicting
<b>noted</b> 4:20	observed 11:1	<b>once</b> 13:19	17:17 34:14,15
<b>notes</b> 6:7 9:11	15:12 24:4,20	39:25 52:20	35:2,18 36:10
9:12 13:15,18	46:18,19 51:3	<b>open</b> 20:17	36:19 37:16
13:21 14:2,4,8	51:8,12,17,19	21:12 44:4	38:4 50:1 53:6
14:10,11 21:14	52:1,9,25	55:20	53:8
<b>number</b> 3:7,9	54:12 56:25	operated 57:7	overprediction
3:11 8:11 16:9	october 38:17	operating 48:3	23:22 25:11
22:15 37:14	offered 38:16	48:13 51:1	owens 18:24
44:8 51:5	38:16,21	operational	р
53:17	offering 22:5	57:9	<b>p</b> 2:1,1
numbers 9:13	38:10	operations	<b>p.m.</b> 1:18 57:24
33:23	<b>oh</b> 8:21 46:2	48:17	<b>p.o.</b> 2:9
0	49:7	opinion 7:19	page 3:2 9:23
oath 5:21	okay 5:20 6:6	52:25	10:25 11:13
<b>object</b> 18:9,15	6:21 7:1,2,16	opinions 10:10	20:22 32:14
20:12 24:23	8:5,22 9:4,9	10:13 19:2	45:3,4 48:24
25:19,19 33:8	14:13,19 15:3	22:5 38:10,21	49:8,14,18
33:19,19 34:8	15:5,10,17	<b>order</b> 20:3,21	53:16
35:14 39:2,15	16:9 19:9	20:25 21:20	pages 8:24 21:1
40:13 41:19	20:15 23:6	original 7:14	44:14
42:15 43:7,24	24:10 25:4,8	28:21 31:7	panel 42:6,9,21
47:6,15,23	25:12 26:2	38:2,23 50:3	55:2,11
48:6,15 52:17	29:12 31:13,14	57:2	paper 9:5,8,10
54:23	31:16,23 32:22	originally	paragraph
objected 25:2	34:25 35:20	28:17 29:9	54:10
objection 20:12	38:15 40:17	33:4	participated
22:14,25	43:14 44:7,7	outside 20:12	42:5,8
objections	44:11,15,22	22:14 43:24	particularly
18:19 21:9	45:2,15,20	44:2 47:15	20:8
	46:6,9 47:10	54:23	

	T	I	
<b>parties</b> 4:14,18	56:8,12,14,18	provide 10:15	questioning
58:12	56:19	10:17 11:9	34:1
<b>path</b> 41:25	please 4:17	17:2	questions 19:1
<b>pause</b> 4:17	<b>point</b> 15:16	<b>provided</b> 10:19	20:25 21:5
<b>pc</b> 17:20 54:12	22:7,11,21	12:16,22 20:21	33:21 45:3
<b>pce</b> 16:4 24:3	23:5 30:17	20:22 21:16	55:17,24 56:4
24:14,19	39:12 40:4	22:15 26:16	56:23 57:13
<b>peek</b> 31:13	56:16	56:7 57:4	58:6
peer 8:7	pointed 11:3	<b>publication</b> 7:9	<b>quick</b> 53:15
people 43:11	pointing 27:2	7:18	55:23 56:3
percent 28:11	portion 10:21	published 6:24	quickly 44:14
30:5 32:10	35:21	7:6 8:6,7 24:11	<b>quite</b> 40:14
54:15,17	possible 28:20	25:20 27:17,25	<b>quote</b> 24:2 26:7
perfect 11:2	possibly 57:7	30:21 32:6,23	r
performed 13:1	precise 36:14	33:3 36:1,5	r 2:1 58:1
15:1 45:5	preclude 28:10	38:2 39:21,22	rate 52:20
period 57:12	present 2:13	45:6 49:15	rather 7:21
personal 58:7	preserve 44:3	53:10 55:8	52:23
pertains 23:1,3	prevent 5:25	57:3	ratio 15:13
<b>pertinent</b> 6:10	previous 22:15	<b>pull</b> 53:14	rdr 2:20
phases 42:22	previously	<b>put</b> 13:19	read 36:13
philosophy	39:20,21	$\mathbf{q}$	39:25
55:3	primary 43:9	<b>qa</b> 26:16	real 16:17,25
<b>place</b> 40:23	printed 6:20	qc 26:16	really 42:16
plaintiff 2:2	<b>prior</b> 5:10,17	qualitatively	53:14
<b>plaintiffs</b> 6:9	11:25 14:1	19:21 50:17	realtime 58:19
11:23 12:18	21:3,13 45:21	52:15	reanalyzing
<b>plant</b> 9:19	46:14,15 48:12	question 10:2	30:19
13:11 15:21	probably 17:3	15:8 18:16	reask 40:18
16:8 23:17	55:10	19:10 40:15,18	reason 39:23
27:18 31:10	problem 21:22	54:4 55:14	reassess 41:25
35:21 36:6,7	proceedings	56:22	rebuttal 38:18
37:20,25 38:7	58:4,9		38:22 39:9,13
43:16 53:5			

40:1 41:11	referring 6:13	repeat 19:10	represent 17:6
recalculate	15:2,6 31:9,11	36:13	34:12
43:3	31:12	report 3:8 6:14	representations
recalculated	refers 12:10	6:18,22,25	21:21
26:19 29:18	refined 10:20	7:10,14 8:10	represents
31:5 35:23	reflect 12:25	8:24 9:1,16	32:12 34:13
36:24 37:11	14:10 31:24	10:3,6,7,9,10	35:2,17 58:8
recalculating	32:3	10:13,22 11:24	reproducibility
35:10 37:19	reflected 14:8	12:20,23 14:9	33:2
54:18	27:24 39:8	14:10 17:9	request 20:22
recalculation	reflecting	19:2 21:15,16	requested 14:2
33:10	13:15	21:24 22:6,16	21:13
recalculations	reflects 13:5,9	22:16 23:1,2,7	requirement
37:25	32:4 41:10	23:21,25,25	33:1
recall 10:21	45:4	24:8,12 25:15	reserve 18:23
12:7 13:16	regarding	26:3,13,18	20:16 55:19
24:6 30:5	20:25 56:7,9	27:17 29:17	respect 13:1
42:16,19	registered	31:21 33:3	23:4 27:1
receive 12:4	58:19	36:2,5 37:18	respectively
recognized	related 14:25	38:3,17,18,22	52:6
43:14	22:7	38:22 39:6,8,9	response 40:1
reconstructed	relates 1:7	39:20 40:1,2	result 7:25
16:6	21:25	41:10,12 44:20	58:13
<b>record</b> 4:2,21	relevant 18:22	54:20 55:2,7	resulted 31:5
18:23 20:19	19:1	56:6	35:11 36:24
55:15 57:9,18	reliability	reporter 2:21	results 16:5,16
57:19	38:11,11 56:10	4:22 53:20	16:24 17:20
recorded 52:24	<b>relief</b> 55:21	57:20 58:19,19	19:21,25 26:17
records 57:6	remote 1:14 4:7	reporting 4:17	30:21 31:24
reduced 58:7	4:17	<b>reports</b> 27:3,25	41:3 42:25
reducing 52:20	remotely 4:15	28:21 32:23	54:14 56:24
<b>refer</b> 9:7 25:24	4:16	39:13,22,24	review 10:14
reference 7:14	removing	43:20 57:2	11:24 12:20
	27:20		27:3
L	Collrani Ta		1

	I		
reviewed 8:7	S	scenario 29:21	separately 16:7
12:2	s 2:1,8	29:24 32:6,7,8	57:5
<b>right</b> 5:13 9:6,7	safe 15:8	32:9,22 33:10	september 5:18
9:21,24 13:3	sample 27:20	34:5,16,17	series 15:18
14:17 15:13	29:10,15 45:8	35:5,15 36:1	<b>serve</b> 21:11
16:4 17:17,24	45:17 46:10,19	36:12,15,21	<b>seven</b> 57:7
18:23 19:22	51:5,8 52:4,25	37:2,6 45:1	several 56:23
20:1,16 22:8	sampled 16:20	scenarios 32:5	<b>share</b> 8:14,17
22:22 23:2,22	sampled 10.20 samples 26:7,9	35:24 44:23	<b>sheet</b> 32:15
24:8,8,9 28:1,6	26:10,12,17,20	scientific 33:2	sheets 13:23
30:3 31:12	27:4,11,23	<b>scope</b> 18:12,20	26:16
33:5,22 36:10	28:15,19 29:8	20:12 22:14	<b>short</b> 57:12,12
36:19 37:4,12	29:19 30:14	43:24 44:3	shorthand 58:6
37:16 38:5,25	31:3,4 33:12	47:16 54:24	<b>show</b> 11:5
39:9 40:25	34:18,20 35:6	55:18	44:14
42:6,10 44:3	35:8 36:22	<b>screen</b> 8:14,17	showed 11:2
44:24 45:24	37:7,9 40:25	9:14	showing 9:14
46:21 49:8	41:8 45:21	scroll 8:23	<b>shows</b> 11:6
50:1,8,13 51:7	48:11,11 49:3	44:13	<b>shut</b> 47:3,7,21
51:14,25 53:6	49:10,20 51:11	scrutiny 43:5	48:21 51:23
54:6,10 55:20	52:5	<b>second</b> 45:11	52:21
<b>rmr</b> 58:18	sampling 9:18	section 7:15	<b>side</b> 54:6,10
robinson 2:20	15:16 16:17,25	11:15 32:18	signature 58:18
4:22 58:18	17:23 20:1	34:1 54:5	simulate 51:12
rogers 7:6	28:15,15 36:24	<b>see</b> 5:8 6:3 30:9	simulated
<b>room</b> 6:3,4,5,7	43:14,15 45:21	32:20 40:6	10:25 15:12,17
6:23 9:5	46:14 48:20	55:5	16:5,16,24
<b>rough</b> 57:21	saw 39:23	seek 18:24	17:20 19:25
roughly 49:16	saw 37.23 saying 11:5	55:20	24:3,14,19
<b>row</b> 51:5	17:12 45:1	<b>sense</b> 16:20	27:6 51:1,6,8
<b>rpr</b> 2:20 58:18	says 9:23 10:25	31:18	51:12,19,23
<b>rule</b> 5:20	54:11	sensitive 30:9	52:6 54:11
<b>rules</b> 5:15,16	J 1.11	sensitivity	56:24
		11:19 30:8,20	
		11.17 50.0,20	

[sir - talk] Page 14

<b>sir</b> 5:12 17:14	standards 55:3	submitted 6:9	27:16 31:9
29:23	<b>start</b> 32:17	6:14 9:1 12:20	32:19 33:22
slightly 38:7	55:4	38:17,18 44:19	34:2,17 35:22
<b>slower</b> 52:20	started 30:17	submitting	37:20,24 44:6
<b>small</b> 30:8	starting 50:23	11:25 39:12	44:20 45:22
somewhat 5:13	50:25 54:9	substantial	46:15 47:1,2
<b>sorry</b> 24:24	<b>starts</b> 56:16	41:20	47:20 53:4
46:3 49:8	state 23:6	substantially	54:7,12 56:9
<b>sort</b> 5:14 11:19	<b>stated</b> 25:15	24:4,20	56:13,21
18:19 30:8	29:11 33:25	suggest 26:25	<b>sure</b> 21:21
37:19 46:23	54:19	suggested	40:14 57:23
sounds 14:3	statement 24:6	12:11 30:2,4	swear 4:23
17:10	<b>states</b> 1:1 4:10	30:13 55:11	<b>sworn</b> 4:16 5:1
southern 1:3	4:10 24:1	suggestion	t
<b>speak</b> 10:12	32:19 55:7	26:24	t 58:1,1
speaking 4:18	station 2:9	<b>sup</b> 21:15	table 3:10
16:14 20:5	statistic 14:15	supervision	27:16,19 31:15
21:9 22:19	statistics 11:4	58:8	31:21,24 32:2
55:19	17:5	supplemental	32:4,5,12,17,18
specifically	stenographic	3:8 6:14,21	34:2 35:21
24:7	4:21	7:10,13 8:10	tables 28:2
spiliotopoulos	<b>steps</b> 27:6 40:4	9:1,16 12:23	29:4
2:14	52:23	14:8 19:2	take 15:21
spreadsheet	<b>stop</b> 34:3	21:15,16,24	21:17 23:4
13:9 20:23	straightforward	22:6 23:1,2	34:16
27:15 44:6,17	13:24	26:3,18 29:17	taken 1:15
48:25 51:4	strictly 15:6	32:15 39:6	26:20 31:1
spreadsheets	18:10 23:3	44:20 56:6	33:12 34:18
6:18,22 12:22	<b>strike</b> 20:4 32:1	supplied 56:20	35:6 36:22
12:25 13:5	45:11	<b>supply</b> 3:10	37:7 49:10
21:1 44:22	studies 7:8	9:18 13:7	58:5
standard 53:10	<b>study</b> 8:1,3	15:20 16:7	talk 14:13
54:16,17 55:11	56:15	23:9,12 24:5	25:25
		24:21 25:10	23.23
	1	1	

[talking - tt23] Page 15

talking 10:24	23:12,17,24	third 48:24	transcript 58:4
14:23 15:9	24:1 26:5 27:9	thought 40:5	58:9
25:9 45:24	27:25 28:25	41:24 46:2	transcripts
46:7	32:19 33:4	57:10	42:18
tarawa 6:10,24	36:6 37:21,23	three 8:24	transport 7:22
9:18 13:2,7,11	37:24 38:3,24	threw 13:20	16:4 41:22
15:6,9 16:1	40:10,21,23	14:4	42:24 54:13
17:21 20:8	41:16 42:20	thursday 4:5	treated 56:19
21:25 22:2	43:4,20 44:24	time 4:6 5:13	57:5
23:3,7,8,11,16	45:6 47:1,2,3	18:24 19:11	treatment 9:19
23:24,25 26:5	47:20 49:22	21:6,18,19	13:11 15:20
27:9,25 28:25	51:2 56:8	27:6 29:3	16:8 23:17
32:19 33:4	<b>test</b> 14:16,18	39:19 40:4	27:18 31:10
36:6 37:21,23	30:20 43:17	41:5 42:13,20	35:21 36:6,6
37:24 38:2,24	testified 5:3	52:23,23,23	37:20,25 38:7
40:10,21,23	13:14 40:8	53:21 55:7	43:16 53:5
41:16 42:20	testify 5:21	57:17	56:8,12,14,18
43:4,20 44:24	testifying 6:1	<b>times</b> 30:7	56:19
45:5 47:1,2,2	testimony 14:3	<b>titles</b> 44:25	trend 20:9
47:20 49:22	40:19	<b>today</b> 5:14 6:1	<b>true</b> 8:25 43:2
51:2 56:8	<b>text</b> 11:7	7:18 14:3 15:5	44:16 58:9
team 15:1 41:2	thank 15:24	55:10	<b>truth</b> 5:1,1,2
41:7	34:4 57:13,15	today's 4:5	truthfully 5:21
technique 7:23	thereto 58:6	40:20	6:1
tell 5:1 30:12	<b>thing</b> 17:13	together 15:21	<b>try</b> 28:18
52:15 53:11	<b>things</b> 11:12	31:2	tt 3:10 23:13
tells 52:18,18	12:12 18:18	tool 55:4	25:10 38:6
<b>term</b> 17:3	<b>think</b> 10:23	<b>top</b> 51:5 54:9	46:1 53:4,5
terms 15:12,15	11:1,12 15:19	54:10	54:13
terrace 6:10,25	17:1 18:21,21	<b>topic</b> 18:22	<b>tt23</b> 23:13
9:18 13:2,7,11	23:20 30:15,17	<b>total</b> 54:11	45:14,25 46:8
15:6,9 16:1	31:15 46:4	towards 11:12	46:15,19 48:2
17:22 20:8	thinking 30:18	trans 42:17	48:7 50:24
22:1,3 23:3,7,8			52:5 56:25

Page 16 [tt23 - water]

	T		
57:5,5,6	49:7	28:23 29:18	verbatim 42:17
tt25 45:14 48:2	understandable	30:21,22 32:13	verbiage 10:19
48:7	14:12	42:1 49:4,10	10:20
<b>tt26</b> 45:14,16	understanding	49:20 52:22	versus 4:9
45:24 46:2,5	14:15 22:10	57:12	11:17
48:2,7 57:8	26:4 40:19	v	<b>video</b> 1:14 4:7
turn 31:20	50:6	<b>valid</b> 12:13	videoconfere
48:24	understood	40:4	1:16
turned 8:18	6:12 7:16 8:8	value 11:5,17	videographer
<b>two</b> 5:10 6:22	9:15 11:21	15:17 27:5,5	2:17 4:1,4
12:22 15:15	12:14 13:25	28:9,22,23	53:22 54:1
18:18 21:3	14:22 15:24	29:12,15,22,25	57:16
31:1 33:22	17:6 22:4	30:7,13 31:4	violated 54:17
48:11 57:3	25:23 27:8	33:13 36:9	voluntarily
u	30:25 32:16	37:9 41:7	20:20
<b>u</b> 2:8	38:9 50:4	46:19 51:1,3	vonweigen 2:18
<b>uh</b> 41:13 57:1	51:18	51:16,19,24	vonwiegen 4:3
um 40:14 47:13	undetect 40:25	52:1,24	W
unaltered	<b>united</b> 1:1 4:9	values 11:20,20	walk 52:4
30:22	4:10	23:21 24:2,14	want 14:13
unbiased 11:6	untimely 21:16	24:18 27:22	29:7
17:2	<b>updated</b> 13:1,6	28:3,6 29:19	wanted 28:18
uncertainty	13:10	30:10,23,24	44:11 45:2
29:13	usdoj.gov 2:10	34:12 36:24	washington 2:9
undefined 28:6	2:11	38:2 40:3,9,24	water 1:6 4:8
under 5:21	use 7:7 49:2	46:18 48:1	9:18,19 13:3
7:14 11:14	55:3,10	49:11 52:6,9	13:11 14:25
34:5,17 43:5	used 7:21,22	52:14 56:24,25	15:20 16:6,7
58:7	11:11 17:2	variety 28:8	17:22 19:22
underpredicti	27:7 54:13	41:21	23:8,12,17
16:11,15 37:3	uses 7:6	various 44:23	24:5,21 25:10
understand	<b>using</b> 7:24	various 44.23	27:16,18,18
unuti Staliu	11 10 10 11	varying 11.20	27.10,10,10
	11:18 12:11		21.0 10 22.21
5:18,23 40:14	26:6,19 28:10		31:9,10 33:21

Page 17 [water - zoom]

34:2,17 35:21	53:4 54:8,13	Z
35:22 36:5,6	56:9,13,21	<b>zero</b> 28:5,10
37:20,20,23,24	57:8	32:22 36:1
38:6,12 41:6	went 7:24	<b>zoom</b> 1:16
42:9 43:20	49:25 52:12	<b>Z00III</b> 1.10
44:6,20 53:4,5	wide 41:21	
54:7,12 56:7,8	witness 4:15,23	
56:12,13,14,18	4:25 19:8 25:3	
56:18,19,19,20	25:7 55:16	
56:20	58:10	
watermodeling	<b>words</b> 16:13	
3:12	17:19 30:21	
way 18:1 19:5	32:3	
19:13 30:20,22	<b>work</b> 18:13	
50:11,15	39:20	
ways 18:11	<b>world</b> 16:17,25	
28:9	<b>worth</b> 46:5	
we've 5:9 18:12	<b>write</b> 10:14	
weitz 2:3	writing 58:7	
weitzlux.com	written 13:23	
2:5,6	24:12	
<b>wells</b> 3:10 9:19	<b>wrong</b> 49:7	
13:7 15:20	X	
16:7 23:9,12	<b>x</b> 3:1	
24:5,21 25:10		
27:16 31:10	<b>y</b>	
32:19 33:22	yeah 11:14	
34:2,17 35:22	19:13 38:8	
37:20,24 43:16	46:8 53:23	
44:6,20 45:13	56:3	
45:22 46:15	year 13:14	
47:1,2,21 48:3	york 2:4,4	
48:12,12,21		
51:23 52:21		
L		